

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-7 are pending in the present application, with claims 1, 6 and 7 being independent. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is kindly requested.

**The Section 112 Rejection**

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicant has amended claim 6 as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is kindly requested.

**The Section 102 Rejections**

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Milton et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,631,018 (hereinafter "Milton"). Claims 1-3, 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Duerksen, US Patent No. 6,608,709 (hereinafter "Duerksen"). Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Each of the claims includes, among other things, the feature of selectively routing optical channels from a WDM input signal to a plurality of other interfaces using a plurality of intra-node outputs at each interface.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Milton nor Duerksen teach or suggest the selective routing of optical channels from a WDM input signal to a

*plurality* of other interfaces using a *plurality* of intra-node outputs at each interface as in the claims of the present invention.

Instead, Milton appears to disclose the routing of a single output from a WDM input signal to a *single* interface (see Fig. 2 ). Similarly, referring now to FIG. 1 of Duerksen, a first interface (including optical circulators 10, 20 and 60) contains one intra-node output routed from the WDM input signal through circulator 20. The single intra-node output in Duerksen is routed to *one* second interface (including circulator 30, 40 and 50), not to a plurality of interfaces as in the claims of the present invention.

Because Milton and Doerksen fail to disclose each and every feature of the claimed inventions, neither Milton nor Doerksen can anticipate the subject matter of claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

### **The Section 103 Rejections**

Claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Duerksen in view of Milton. Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claims 4 and 5 depend on claim 1 and are, therefore, patentable over the combination of Duerksen and Milton for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1 and because the combination of Duerksen and Milton does not make up for the deficiencies set forth above.


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact John E. Curtin at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

In the event this Response does not place the present application in condition for allowance, applicant requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned at (703) 266-3330 to schedule a personal interview.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3777 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

CAPITOL PATENT & TRADEMARK LAW FIRM, PLLC.

By   
John E. Curtin, Reg. No. 37,602  
P.O. Box 1995  
Vienna, Virginia 22183  
(703) 266-3330